United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Six-Year Review

Chemical Contaminants

Health Effects Technical Support Document

Office of Water
Office of Science and Technology
EPA 822-R-02-001
February 2002

EPA 822-R-02-001

Six-Year Review

Chemical Contaminants

Health Effects

Technical Support Document

February 2002

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water
Office of Science and Technology
Health and Ecological Criteria Division
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (4304T)
Washington, DC 20460

This report is issued in support of the preliminary revise/not revise decisions for the Six-Year Review Notice of Intent. It is intended for public comment and does not represent final Agency policy. EPA expects to issue a final version of this report with the publication of the final notice in 2002, reflecting corrections due to public comment on the preliminary notice and the supporting documents.

CONTENTS

Tables

Abbreviations

ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
BMD	Benchmark dose
DEHA	Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate
EC	European Commission
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FQPA	Food Quality Protection Act
GI	Gastrointestinal
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System
LOAEL	Lowest-observed-adverse-effect level
MCL	Maximum contaminant level
MCLG	Maximum contaminant level goal
MF	Modifying factor
MFL	Million fibers per liter
MRL	Minimal risk level
NA	Not available
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NDWAC	National Drinking Water Advisory Council
NIEHS	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
NOAEL	No-observed-adverse-effect level
NPDWR	National primary drinking water regulation
NTP	National Toxicology Program
OPP	Office of Pesticide Programs
OST	Office of Science and Technology
OW	Office of Water
RfD	Reference dose
RSC	Relative source contribution
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
TT	Treatment technology
UF	Uncertainty factor
UL	Tolerable upper intake level
WHO	World Health Organization

1. INTRODUCTION

EPA has developed a *Protocol for the Review of Existing National Primary Drinking Water Regulations* (US EPA 2002a) based on recommendations of the National Drinking Water Advisory Council (NDWAC 2000), through consultations with stakeholders representing a wide variety of interest groups, and internal Agency deliberations. The Protocol outlines the approach to be used to review and identify national primary drinking water regulations (NPDWRs) that warrant revision, to maintain, or provide for greater, public health protection. The key elements of the review process are health effects, analytical and treatment technology, other regulatory revisions (e.g., monitoring and reporting requirements), occurrence and exposure analysis, and, as appropriate, economic considerations.

The purpose of the health effects component of the review process is to identify, within the limitations of the Agency's available resources, new health risk assessments that indicate possible change to the maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) and, perhaps, to the maximum contaminant level (MCL).

A total of 68 regulated chemical contaminants are being considered during this first 6-year review cycle. These are inorganic and organic contaminants regulated prior to the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments of 1996, except arsenic, radionuclides, disinfectant residuals, and disinfection by-products, which have undergone recent revision.

2. MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL GOAL

Because the identification of contaminants for potential revision based on health effects is dependent on whether or not the MCLG could change, a brief explanation of the derivation of the MCLG is warranted. The MCLG is the maximum level of a contaminant in drinking water at which no known or anticipated adverse health effects occur, allowing for an adequate margin of safety. MCLGs are nonenforceable health goals. EPA establishes the MCL based on the MCLG. The MCL is the maximum permissible level of a contaminant in water that is delivered to any user of a public water system. Prior to the 1996 Amendments to the SDWA, the MCL was set as close to the MCLG as was feasible. The 1996 Amendments to the SDWA permit consideration of costs and benefits in establishing an MCL. MCLs are enforceable standards.

2.1. Reference Dose

For chemicals exhibiting a threshold for toxic effects, EPA establishes the MCLG on the basis of an oral reference dose (RfD). A change in the RfD could lead to a change in the MCLG and thus in the MCL. The RfD is an estimate (with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude) of a daily oral exposure to the human population (including sensitive subgroups) that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious noncancer effects during a lifetime. The RfD is derived as follows:

$$\text{RfD (mg/kg/day)} = \frac{\text{NOAEL or LOAEL or BMD}}{\text{UF} \times \text{MF}}$$

where:

NOAEL	=	no-observed-adverse-effect level (mg/kg/day)
LOAEL	=	lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (mg/kg/day)
BMD	=	benchmark dose (mg/kg/day)
UF	=	uncertainty factor
MF	=	modifying factor

The UF is used to account for the extrapolation uncertainties (e.g., interindividual variation, interspecies differences, duration of exposure, use of a LOAEL in place of a NOAEL), and database adequacy. The MF is used as a judgment factor to account for the confidence in the critical study (or studies) used in the derivation of the RfD (US EPA 2000).

The MCLG is then derived from the RfD as follows:

$$\text{MCLG (mg/liter)} = \frac{\text{RfD} \times \text{bw} \times \text{RSC}}{\text{I}}$$

where:

bw	=	body weight (70 kg for adults, 10 kg for children, 4 kg for infants);
RSC	=	relative source contribution, the fraction of the RfD allocated to drinking water (to take into account exposure from other sources);
I	=	daily drinking water intake (2 liters for adults, 1 liter for children, 0.64 liter for infants).

Generally, EPA assumes that the relative source contribution from drinking water is 20% of the RfD, unless other exposure data for the chemical are available. The RSC is one factor that will determine whether or not a change in the RfD will lead to a change in the MCLG.

It has also been the Agency policy to apply an additional safety factor to the RfD for chemicals with equivocal evidence of carcinogenicity (Section 2.2). This practice is another factor that must be evaluated to determine the impact of a change in RfD on the MCLG.

2.2. Assessment of Carcinogenicity

For drinking water contaminants regulated prior to the 1996 SDWA, OW followed a three-category regulatory cancer classification system (Categories I, II, or III). These categories specify decisions as to degree of concern for an agent's carcinogenic potential as a contaminant of drinking water, and define to some extent the approach to risk management that is taken for establishing MCLGs. Categories I, II, and III are designations not defined in guidelines but that reflect OW policy.

EPA used the six alphanumeric categories (A, B1, B2, C, D, E) of the 1986 cancer guidelines (US EPA 1986) in establishing the MCLG. The six-group classification system is often equated to the three-category system in the NPDWR Federal Register announcements. Table 1 describes the three categories and, with few exceptions (e.g., beryllium), their usual

equivalent alphanumeric classification. If a chemical is a known or probable human carcinogen (Category I, generally Group A or B), the MCLG is generally set at zero because it is assumed, in the absence of other data, that there is no known threshold for carcinogenicity. If a chemical falls in Group C, a RfD approach along with an additional safety factor is used in deriving the MCLG. The methodology used for establishing MCLGs for chemicals with varying degrees of evidence of carcinogenicity is briefly described in Table 1.

Recent Agency assessments also use the 1996 Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment (US EPA 1996) or the draft revised Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment (US EPA 1999). The proposed and revised Guidelines use standard descriptors as part of the hazard narrative to express the weight of evidence for carcinogenic hazard potential. The new descriptors permit consideration of exposure route and mode of action when making an assessment of carcinogenicity. The hazard descriptors of the 1996 proposed Guidelines, used in this review cycle, are in three categories: "known/likely," "cannot be determined," and "not likely." Subdescriptors are provided under these categories to further differentiate an agent's carcinogenic potential. These hazard descriptors are given in the text whenever appropriate.

3. IDENTIFYING CANDIDATES FOR POSSIBLE REGULATORY REVISION

EPA will identify regulated chemical contaminants for which there have been changes in the RfD and/or in cancer risk assessment from oral exposure. Such changes could result in a change in the MCLG and MCL. Chemicals thus identified are considered candidates for regulatory revision.

Health risk assessments completed under the following programs will be examined:

- EPA Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS)
- EPA Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP)
- National Academy of Sciences (NAS)
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)

Table 2 lists the 68 chemicals included in the 6-year review process, the RfDs and cancer groups on which the MCLGs are based, those established by IRIS and OPP, and assessment dates. IRIS dates are difficult to determine with any precision because of numerous sequential revisions described in the "Revision History" for each substance. Dates of IRIS assessments are approximate and refer to the most recent date when significant revisions were made to the RfD or cancer assessment. Risk assessments conducted by IRIS and OPP can be found on EPA's Web addresses www.epa.gov/iris/index.html and www.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/status.htm.

IRIS and OPP do not use the three-category approach for cancer hazard characterization, but use the 1986 Cancer Guidelines and, recently, the 1996 Proposed Guidelines (US EPA 1986, 1996). For easy comparison, Categories I, II, and III on which the MCLGs are based have been replaced by the equivalent cancer groups of the 1986 cancer guidelines (Table 1). If the oral and inhalation cancer groups differ, the cancer groups given in Table 2 are those for oral exposure. Whenever appropriate, the cancer hazard descriptors of the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines are also given in Table 2.

As indicated in Table 2, NAS established in 1997 a tolerable upper intake level (UL) for fluoride of 10 mg/day for children older than 8 years and for adults, based on protection against skeletal fluorosis (NAS 1997). The 1997 NAS evaluation of fluoride does not have an impact on the MCLG. In addition, recent assessments of copper and selenium by NAS (2000 a,b) do not have an impact on the MCLGs for these two chemicals.

ATSDR establishes oral minimal risk levels (MRLs) for non-neoplastic endpoints for acute, intermediate, and chronic exposure durations. MRLs for oral chronic exposure are similar to EPA's RfDs. The chronic MRL for cadmium is the only one among the chemicals under consideration that is more recent than and different from the RfD established by IRIS and in the regulation of 1991. As such, cadmium would qualify for possible revision. However, a new IRIS assessment of cadmium is due in 2002 or 2003 (Table 3). Review of cadmium should therefore await completion of the Agency's ongoing assessment. In summary, ATSDR completed assessments do not have an impact on the selection of chemicals for potential revision during this first 6-year review cycle.

Seven chemicals given in bold in Table 2 potentially qualify for revision, because of different RfD and/or cancer groups postdating the MCLG. However, updated assessments for alachlor (IRIS), diquat (OPP), and glyphosate (IRIS) are expected in 2002 or 2003 (Table 3). Therefore, review of these three chemicals should await completion of the Agency's ongoing assessments. The remaining four chemicals are potential candidates for additional consideration and are listed below together with the latest assessment date.

Beryllium (IRIS 1998)	Oxamyl (OPP 2000)
Chromium (IRIS 1998)	Picloram (OPP 1998)

This tentative identification of chemicals potentially qualifying for revision was conducted independently of other considerations (e.g., magnitude of gain in health protection, data gaps, analytical and treatment technology, occurrence), which may influence the final selection of contaminants to be revised.

For some chemicals with an MCLG of zero (chlordane, vinyl chloride), a change in RfD postdating the regulation occurred in 1998 or later without a change in cancer group. These chemicals do not potentially qualify for revision because, following Agency policy, the MCLG for these chemicals will remain at zero, irrespective of any change in RfD.

4. NOMINATION OF CHEMICALS FOR NEW RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1. Priority Chemicals of Potential Reproductive/Developmental Concern

With the passage of the SDWA and FQPA of 1996, a concerted effort was made by EPA to take into account reproductive and developmental effects, and effects of chemicals on sensitive subpopulations. However, contaminants under consideration in this first 6-year review cycle were regulated in 1992 or earlier and might not have received adequate scrutiny for reproductive and developmental effects. Accordingly, a literature search was conducted by EPA's Office of Science and Technology (OST) to identify contaminants for which developmental and/or reproductive effects might now appear to be the critical effects.[1] Contaminants thus identified will be nominated, as high priority for new Agency assessments.

New assessments by IRIS or OPP are ongoing for several chemicals included in this first 6-year review cycle. Any reproductive or developmental effects of these chemicals will be taken fully into consideration as part of these new assessments. Therefore, evaluation of the literature search for reproductive/developmental effects was not considered useful for the 33 chemicals listed below with ongoing IRIS (US EPA 2002b) or OPP assessments. Expected completion years of these assessments are indicated below. If, upon completion of these new assessments, it is determined that there is a potential impact on the MCLG, the chemicals in question will be considered candidates for possible revision.

Acrylamide (IRIS, 2004/2005)
Alachlor (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Antimony (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Asbestos (IRIS, 2004/2005)
Atrazine (OPP, 2002)
Benzo[a]pyrene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Cadmium (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Carbofuran (OPP, 2002/2003)
Carbon tetrachloride (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Copper (IRIS, 2002/2003)
2,4-D (OPP, 2003/2004)
Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (IRIS, 2002/2003)
1,2-Dichlorobenzene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
1,4-Dichlorobenzene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
1,2-Dichloroethane (IRIS, 2002/2003)
1,1-Dichloroethylene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Diquat (OPP, 2002)
Endothall (OPP, 2003/2004)
Ethylbenzene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Ethylene dibromide (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Glyphosate (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Lindane (IRIS, 2003/2004)
Methoxychlor (OPP, 2002/2003)
Pentachlorophenol (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Polychlorinated biphenyls (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Simazine (OPP, 2003/2004)
Styrene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
2,3,7,8-TCDD (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Tetrachloroethylene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Toluene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
1,1,1-Trichloroethane (IRIS, 2003/2004)
Trichloroethylene (IRIS, 2002/2003)
Xylenes (IRIS, 2002/2003)

Other chemicals are not under review by IRIS or OPP but have an MCLG of zero (Table 2). Evaluation of the literature search was not considered useful for these chemicals because an

[1] Critical effect is defined as the biologically significant adverse effect expected to occur at the lowest dose.

MCLG of zero is already protective of public health and will not be affected by new information on reproductive or developmental effects. However, for chemicals not recently evaluated and having a zero MCLG, EPA reviewed available information to inquire whether recent data show a mode of action that implies nonlinearity of the dose-response. EPA did not find any data to support such a mode of action (IARC, 1999, 2001; ATSDR, 1999). These 12 chemicals and the year of the most recent Agency cancer assessments are given below.

Benzene (00)	1,2-Dichloropropane (91)	Hexachlorobenzene (92)
Chlordane (98)	Epichlorohydrin (92)	Lead (91)
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (91)	Heptachlor (92)	Toxaphene (91)
Dichloromethane (92)	Heptachlor epoxide (92)	Vinyl chloride (00)

In addition, for chemicals with a nonzero MCLG, evaluation of the literature search for reproductive and developmental effects was not considered necessary for new Agency assessments finalized in 1997 or later. These assessments have considered reproductive and developmental toxicity as a part of the evaluation. Agency assessments finalized in 1997 or later are available for seven chemicals. These are barium (1998), beryllium (1998), chromium (1998), hexachlorocyclopentadiene (2001), inorganic mercury (1997), oxamyl (2000), and picloram (1998).

The following summarizes the process of identifying chemicals for which evaluation of the literature search for reproductive and developmental effects is not necessary:

Number of chemicals	**Reason for not evaluating reproductive and developmental literature searches**
33	Ongoing assessments by IRIS or OPP
12	Zero MCLG already protective of reproductive and developmental effects, and no indication at this time for nonlinearity of the dose-response relationship.
7	Nonzero MCLGs, recent ($\geq$1997) Agency assessments available.

The literature search for reproductive and developmental effects for the remaining 16 chemicals listed in Table 4 was evaluated. For various reasons briefly described in Table 4, RfDs for three chemicals—cyanide, di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate and thallium—could be affected by new information on developmental and/or reproductive toxicity. The small number of chemicals thus identified is not surprising, as EPA's selection of contaminants for new IRIS or OPP assessment is biased toward chemicals for which there is an indication that reproductive and/or developmental effects may be of concern. In conclusion, three chemicals are high priority and, at the request of OST, new IRIS risk assessments have been initiated for these chemicals. The new risk assessments are expected to be completed in the 2004/2005 time frame for cyanide, 2003/2004 for di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate, and 2004/2005 for thallium (US EPA 2002b).

4.2. Other Nominations for New Risk Assessment

As described above, the literature search for reproductive and developmental effects for 16 chemicals was evaluated. Three of these chemicals were identified as of potential reproductive or developmental concern, and IRIS risk assessments were initiated in 2002. It was considered desirable to determine, through a literature search for all other toxicological endpoints, if new health effects information had become available for any of the remaining 13 chemicals, in which case the chemical would be nominated for a new assessment.

Of the 13 chemicals under consideration, NAS conducted a recent assessment of selenium (NAS 2000b). Therefore, selenium was eliminated from further consideration and a toxicological literature search was conducted by OST for the remaining 12 chemicals. These are:

Dalapon	Monochlorobenzene
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	Nitrate
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	Nitrite
Dinoseb	2,4,5-TP (Silvex)
Endrin	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene
Fluoride (skeletal effects)	1,1,2-Trichloroethane

There is new information on the effects of fluoride on bone and on the contribution of various sources to total fluoride exposure (dental products, water, food, beverages, etc.). EPA plans to request NAS to conduct a review of these data.

No new information was found for any of the remaining chemicals that could have an impact on the MCLG. Accordingly, and for the time being, these contaminants will not be nominated for new assessments.

Because of considerable stakeholder interest in nitrate and nitrite, a more detailed rationale for not considering these two chemicals as potential candidates for new IRIS assessments is provided here. At the request of EPA, NAS evaluated the 1991 MCLGs and MCLs for nitrate and nitrite. NAS evaluated the epidemiological and toxicological studies available for these chemicals and concluded that EPA's current MCLGs and MCLs for nitrate and nitrite are adequate to protect human health. NAS also concluded that exposure to nitrate/nitrite concentrations found in drinking water in the United States is unlikely to contribute to human cancer risk (NAS 1995). In 1997, California established Public Health Goals for nitrate and nitrite in drinking water identical to EPA's MCLGs and concluded that recent epidemiological studies do not support an association between nitrate and nitrite exposure from drinking water and increased cancer rates in humans (Cal/EPA 1997). More recently, the World Health Organization (WHO) evaluated nitrate and nitrite and established the same "guideline values" for these two chemicals as EPA's MCLGs, to protect against methemoglobinemia in bottle-fed infants below 3 months of age, the most susceptible segment of the population. WHO also concluded that there is no evidence for an association between nitrite and nitrate exposure in humans and the risk of cancer (WHO 1998).

A number of studies on nitrate and nitrite have become available since WHO's assessment of 1998. Some of these studies that could possibly have an impact on the MCLGs are discussed here. In an epidemiological study in Iowa, Weyer et al. (2001) found a positive relationship between nitrate levels in drinking water and risk of bladder and ovarian cancers, and an inverse relationship for cancer of the uterine corpus and rectum. The authors recognized that additional studies were needed before confirming these trends. Several limitations of the study were also pointed out by the authors, including lack of information on individual water consumption and poor characterization of the magnitude of exposure to nitrate, relatively small sample size for bladder cancer, lack of information on occurrence of bladder infections, lack of information on concomitant exposure to other contaminants in drinking water, including disinfection by-products. No clear and consistent associations were found between increasing nitrate in drinking water and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, leukemia, or cancers of the colon, breast, lung, pancreas, or kidney (Weyer et al. 2001). Other epidemiological studies of nitrate and/or nitrite and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (Ward et al. 1996), gastric, esophageal or brain cancer (Van Loon et al. 1998, Barrett et al. 1998) are also inconclusive. Several epidemiological studies of maternal ingestion of nitrate in drinking water failed to confirm an association between nitrate exposure and developmental effects in offspring (e.g., Croen et al. 1997).

There are differing views on the role of nitrate/nitrite versus gastrointestinal infections as the cause of infant methemoglobinemia (Avery 1999, Knobeloch et al. 2000). It is recognized that bottle-fed infants have a high probability of developing GI infections because of their low gastric acidity. It is also recognized that GI infections and low acidity enhance the conversion of nitrate to nitrite and methemoglobin formation in infants. This is an additional reason for considering these infants as a high-risk group for developing methemoglobinemia from exposure to nitrate/nitrite (WHO 1998).

NTP carried out toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of sodium nitrite (NTP 2001). There was no evidence of carcinogenic activity of sodium nitrite in male or female rats, nor in male mice. There was equivocal evidence of carcinogenic activity in female mice based on a positive trend in the incidences of squamous cell papilloma or carcinoma (combined) of the forestomach. Given these conclusions, a change in the cancer assessment of nitrite is not warranted at this time.

The outcome of the review of nitrate and nitrite indicates that the basis of the current MCLGs for these two chemicals remain appropriate and, therefore, we are not nominating nitrate or nitrite for new IRIS assessments at this time.

5. SUMMARY

All conclusions reached in this document should be considered tentative pending receipt of public comments.

Four chemicals have been identified as potentially qualifying for revision on the basis of new IRIS or OPP health assessments that could impact the MCLG. These are beryllium, chromium, oxamyl, and picloram. This tentative identification of chemicals potentially qualifying for revision was conducted independently of other considerations (e.g., analytical and treatment technology, magnitude of gain in health protection, data gaps, occurrence), which may influence the final selection of contaminants to be revised.

Three chemicals, cyanide, di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate, and thallium, are high priority because of reproductive and/or developmental concerns. New IRIS health assessments of these chemicals have been initiated. The new risk assessments are expected to be completed in the 2004/2005 time frame for cyanide, 2003/2004 for di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate, and 2004/2005 for thallium (US EPA 2002b).

New data have become available regarding the effect of fluoride on bone, and the contribution of various sources to total fluoride exposure. EPA plans to request NAS to conduct a review of these data.

Table 5 provides the details of the review process applied to each of the 68 chemicals under consideration.

6. REFERENCES

ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 1992. Toxicological Profile for Thallium. Available at: www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxpro2.html#-A-

ATSDR. 1996. Toxicological Profile for Selenium. Available at: www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxpro2.html#-A-

ATSDR. 1997. Toxicological Profile for Cyanide. Available at: www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxpro2.html#-A-

ATSDR. 1999. Toxicological Profile for Lead. Available at: www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxpro2.html#-A-

Avery AA. 1999. Infantile methemoglobinemia: Reexamining the role of drinking water nitrates. Environ Health Perspect 107(7):583-586.

Barrett JH, Parslow RC, McKinney PA, et al. 1998. Nitrate in drinking water and the incidence of gastric, esophageal, and brain cancer in Yorkshire, England. Cancer Causes Control 9:153-159.

Cal/EPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 1997. Public health goals for nitrate and nitrite in drinking water. December 1997. Available at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/water/phg/allphgs.html

Cal/EPA. 1999. Public health goals for thallium in drinking water. December 1997. Available at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/water/phg/allphgs.html.

Chapin R, Gulati D, Barnes LH. 1997. Sodium nitrite. Environ Health Perspect 105 (Suppl 1).

Croen LA, Todoroff K, Shaw GM. 1997. Maternal dietary nitrate exposure and risk for neural tube defects. Am J Epidemiol 145:S30.

EC (European Commission). 1999. European Commission Scientific Committee on Toxicity, Ecotoxicity and the Environment: Opinion on the toxicological characteristics and risks of certain citrates and adipates used as a substitute for phthalates as plasticisers in certain soft PVC products. 28 September 1999. Brussels, Belgium.

IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). 1999. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Re-evaluation of Some Organic Chemicals, Hydrazine and Hydrogen Peroxide. Vol. 71 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane, pp. 479-500; Dichloromethane, pp. 251-315; 1,2-Dichloropropane, pp. 1393-1400; Epichlorohydrin, pp. 603-628. Lyon, France.

IARC. 2000. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Some Industrial Chemicals. Lyon, France. Vol. 77: Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate, pp. 149-175. Lyon, France.

IARC. 2001. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Some Thyrotropic Agents. Vol. 79: Chlordane and heptachlor, pp. 411-492; Hexachlorobenzene, pp. 493-568; Toxaphene, pp. 569-604. Lyon, France.

Knobeloch L, Salna B, Hogan A, et al. 2000. Blue babies and nitrate-contaminated well water. Environ Health Perspect 108(7):675-678.

NAS (National Academy of Sciences). 1995. Nitrate and nitrite in drinking water. Washington, DC:National Academy Press.

NAS. 1997. Dietary reference intakes for calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, vitamin D, and fluoride. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

NAS. 2000a. Copper in drinking water. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

NAS. 2000b. Dietary reference intakes for vitamin C, vitamin E, selenium, and carotenoids. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

NDWAQ (National Drinking Water Advisory Council). 2000. Recommended guidance for review of existing national primary drinking water regulations, November 2000.

NTP (National Toxicology Program). 1993. Toxicity studies of sodium cyanide, (CAS No. 143-33-9) administered by dosed water to F344/N rats and B6C3F1 mice.

NTP. 1996. Sodium selenate (rats), CAS No. 13410-01-0). Study number: RDGT 94011. May 1, 1996.

NTP. 2001. TR-495. Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of sodium nitrite (CAS No. 7632-00-00) in F344/N rats and $B6C3F_1$ mice.

US EPA. 1986. Guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment. FR Vol. 51, No. 185: 33992-34003. September 24, 1986. Available at: http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/cancer.cfm?ActType=default.

US EPA. 1989. National primary and secondary drinking water regulations; Proposed Rule. FR Vol. 54, No. 97: 22062-22094. May 22, 1989.

US EPA. 1991. National primary drinking water regulations; Final Rule. FR Vol. 56, No. 20: 3526-3597. January 30, 1991.

US EPA. 1996. Proposed guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment. FR Vol. 61, No. 79: 17960-18011. April 23, 1996. Available at: http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/cancer.cfm?ActType=default.

US EPA. 1997. Mercury Study Report to Congress. December 1997. Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards and Office of Research and Development. EPA-452/R-97-009. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/ttncaaal/t3/reports/volume5.pdf.

US EPA. 1999. Guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment. NCEA-F-0644 Review Draft. July 1999. US EPA Risk Assessment Forum. Washington DC.

US EPA. 2000. EPA Summary Report. Characterization of data variability and uncertainty: Health effects assessments in the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). In response to Congress, HR 106-379. National Center for Environmental Assessment, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/635/R-00/005F. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/ncea/pdfs/iris/ncea_repf.pdf.

US EPA. 2002a. EPA Protocol for review of existing national primary drinking water regulations. Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water.

US EPA. 2002b. Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS); Announcement of 2002 Program; Request for information. FR Vol. 67, No. 6:1212-1215. January 9, 2002. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPAFR-CONTENTS/2002/January/Day-09/contents.htm.

Van Loon AJ, Botterweck AA, Goldbohm RA, et al. 1998. Intake of nitrate and nitrite and the risk of gastric cancer: A prospective cohort study. Br J Cancer 78:129-135.

Ward MH, Mark SD, Cantor KP, et al. 1996. Drinking water nitrate and the risk of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Epidemiology 7:465-471.

Weyer PJ, Cerhan JR, Cross BC, et al. 2001. Municipal drinking water nitrate level and cancer risk in older women: the Iowa Women's Health Study. Epidemiology 12(3):327-338.

WHO (World Health Organization). 1996. Guidelines for drinking-water quality, 2nd ed. Vol 2: Health criteria and other supporting information. Geneva, Switzerland. Available at:

http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/GDWQ/Chemicals/Chemlist.html.

WHO. 1998. Guidelines for drinking-water quality, 2nd ed. Addendum to Vol. 1: Recommendations. Geneva, Switzerland. Available at: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/GDWQ/Chemicals/Chemlist.html.

WHO. 2002. World Health Organization. Environmental Health Criteria No. 227: Fluorides. Summary and Conclusions. Geneva, Switzerland. Available at: http://www.who.int/pcs/pcs_new.html.

Table 1. Cancer classification systems used by EPA (US EPA 1986, 1989, 1991)

Three-category approach for establishing MCLGs	Corresponding five-group classification system of 1986 cancer guidelines
MCLG generally set at zero	
Category I: **Known or probable human carcinogens: Strong evidence of carcinogenicity** Sufficient human or animal evidence of carcinogenicity.	**Generally Group A or B** **A: Human carcinogen** Sufficient evidence from epidemiological studies to support a causal association. **B: Probable human carcinogen** ***B1****:* Limited evidence of carcinogenicity from epidemiological studies. ***B2****:* Inadequate evidence or no data from epidemiological studies; sufficient evidence from animal studies.
MCLG based on the RfD with an additional safety factor of up to 10 to account for possible carcinogenicity, or is based on excess cancer risk range of 10^{-5} to 10^{-6}	
Category II: **Limited evidence of carcinogenicity** Some limited but insufficient evidence of carcinogenicity from animal data.	**Generally Group C:** **Possible human carcinogen** Limited evidence of carcinogenicity in animals in the absence of human data.
MCLG established using the RfD approach	
Category III: **Inadequate or no evidence of carcinogenicity in animals**	**Group D or Group E** **D: Not classifiable as to human carcinogenicity** Inadequate human and animal evidence of carcinogenicity, or no data available. **E: Evidence of noncarcinogenicity for humans** No evidence of carcinogenicity in two different animal species, or in both epidemiological and animal studies.

Table 2. Chemicals considered under the first six-year review cycle
(New RfD and/or cancer assessment have become available for seven chemicals given in **bold**).

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
1. Acrylamide	0 (1/91)	TT	0.0002	B2	0.0002 (91)	B2 (91)		
2. Alachlor	**0 (1/91)**	**0.002**	**0.01**	**B2**	**0.01 (93)**	**NA**	**0.01 (9/98)**	**— [1] (9/98)**
3. Antimony	0.006 (7/92)	0.006	0.0004	D	0.0004 (91)	NA		
4. Asbestos (fibers > 10 μm in length)	7 MFL (1/91)	7 MFL	—	C [2]	NA	— [3] (88)		
5. Atrazine	0.003 (1/91)	0.003 (1/91)	0.005	C	0.035 (93)	NA		
6. Barium	2 (7/91)	2	0.07	D	0.07 (98)	D[4] (98)		
7. Benzene	0 (7/87)	0.005	—	A	NA	A [5] (00)		
8. Benzo[a]pyrene	0 (7/92)	0.0002	—	B2	NA	B2 (92)		

[1] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, alachlor is likely to be carcinogenic to humans at high doses, but not likely at low doses.

[2] Group C based on limited evidence of carcinogenicity by the oral route (US EPA 1989). Group A by inhalation exposure.

[3] Limited animal evidence for carcinogenicity via ingestion, and epidemiologic data in this regard are inadequate. Group A by inhalation exposure.

[4] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, barium is considered not likely to be carcinogenic to humans following oral exposure.

[5] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, benzene is characterized as a known human carcinogen for all routes of exposure.

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
9. Beryllium	**0.004 (7/92)**	**0.004**	**0.005**	**B2** [6]	**0.002 (98)**	**B1** [7] **(98)**		
10. Cadmium	0.005 (1/91)	0.005	0.0005	D	0.0005 (91)	— [8] (91)		
11. Carbofuran	0.04 (1/91)	0.04	0.005	E	0.005 (87)	NA		
12. Carbon tetrachloride	0 (7/87)	0.005	0.0007	B2	0.0007 (91)	B2 (91)		
13. Chlordane	0 (1/91)	0.002	0.00006	B2	0.0005 (98)	B2 [9] (98)	Canceled	
14. Chromium (total) **Cr (VI)** **Cr (III)**	**0.1 (1/91)**	**0.1**	**0.005**	**D**	 **0.003 (98)** **1.5 (98)**	 **D** [10] **(98)** **D** [11] **(98)**		

[6] EPA classified beryllium in Group B2, probable human carcinogen, based on clear evidence of its carcinogenicity via inhalation or injection in several animal species. However, EPA also placed beryllium in drinking water Category II for regulation (limited evidence of carcinogenicity considering the weight of evidence for carcinogenicity via ingestion, potency, exposure, and pharmacokinetics). The MCLG was derived using the RfD and applying an additional safety factor of 10 for possible carcinogenic potential.

[7] B1 based on inhalation exposure. Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, inhaled beryllium was characterized as a "likely" carcinogen in humans, and the human carcinogenic potential of ingested beryllium cannot be determined.

[8] Carcinogenicity studies of cadmium administered orally to animals have shown no evidence of carcinogenic response. B1 based on inhalation exposure.

[9] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, chlordane was characterized as a likely carcinogen by all routes of exposure.

[10] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, the oral carcinogenicity of Cr (VI) cannot be determined.

[11] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, there are inadequate data to determine the potential carcinogenicity of Cr (III).

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
15. Copper	1.3 [12] (6/91)	TT [12]	—	D	NA	D (88)		
16. Cyanide	0.2 (7/92)	0.2	0.02	D	0.02 (87)	D		
17. 2,4-D (2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid)	0.07 (1/91)	0.07	0.01	D	0.01 (87)	NA		D (7/96)
18. Dalapon (2,2-Dichloropropionic acid)	0.2 (7/92)	0.2	0.03	D	0.03 (88)	NA	Canceled	
19. Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate	0.4 (7/92)	0.4	0.6	C	0.6 (92)	C (92)		
20. Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	0 (7/92)	0.006	0.02	B2	0.02 (88)	B2 (88)		
21. 1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	0 (1/91)	0.0002	—	B2	NA (91)	NA	Canceled	
22. Dichlorobenzene o-(1,2-Dichlorobenzene)	0.6 (1/91)	0.6	0.09	D	0.09 (90)	D (90)	Canceled	
23. Dichlorobenzene p-(1,4-Dichlorobenzene)	0.075 (7/87)	0.075	0.1	C	NA (94)	NA		
24. Dichloroethane(1,2-) (Ethylene dichloride)	0 (7/87)	0.005	—	B2	NA	B2 (91)	Canceled	
25. Dichloroethylene (1,1-)	0.007 (7/87)	0.007	0.009	C	0.009 (89)	C (98)		
26. Dichloroethylene (cis-1,2-)	0.07 (1/91)	0.07	0.01	D	NA	D (90)		
27. Dichloroethylene (trans-1,2-)	0.1 (1/91)	0.1	0.02	D	0.02 (88)	NA		
28. Dichloromethane (methylene chloride)	0 (7/92)	0.005	0.06	B2	0.06 (91)	B2 (91)	Canceled	
29. Dichloropropane (1,2-)	0 (1/91)	0.005	—	B2	NA (91)	NA		
30. Dinoseb	0.007 (7/92)	0.007	0.001	D	0.001 (89)	D (89)	Canceled	

[12] NAS (2000a) considered that the MCLG for copper was appropriate. Copper action level: 1.3 mg/L.

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
31. Diquat	**0.02 (7/92)**	**0.02**	**0.0022**	**D**	**0.0022 (87)**	**NA**	**0.005 (3/95)**	**E (3/95)**
32. Endothall	0.1 (7/92)	0.1	0.02	D	0.02 (87)	NA		
33. Endrin	0.002 (7/92)	0.002	0.0003	D	0.0003 (89)	D (89)	Canceled	
34. Epichlorohydrin	0 (1/91)	TT	NA	B2	NA	B2 (92)		
35. Ethylbenzene	0.7 (1/91)	0.7	0.1	D	0.1 (91)	D (91)		
36. Ethylene dibromide (EDB; 1,2-Dibromoeth-ane)	0 (1/91)	0.00005	—	B2	NA	B2 (91)	Canceled	
37. Fluoride [13]	4.0 (11/85)	4.0 (4/86)	0.11 [14]	—	0.06[15] 0.12[16] (87)	NA		
38. Glyphosate	**0.7 (7/92)**	**0.7**	**0.1**	**D**	**0.1 (89)**	**D (89)**	**2 (9/93)**	**E (9/93)**
39. Heptachlor	0 (1/91)	0.0004	0.0005	B2	0.0005 (91)	B2 (91)	0.0005 (92)	B2 (92)
40. Heptachlor epoxide	0 (1/91)	0.0002	0.000013	B2	0.000013 (91)	B2 (91)	0.000013 (92)	B2 (92)
41. Hexachlorobenzene	0 (7/92)	0.001	0.0008	B2	0.0008 (91)	B2 (91)	Canceled	

[13] NAS (1997) established a tolerable upper intake level (UL) for fluoride of 10 mg/day for children older than 8 years and for adults, based on protection against skeletal fluorosis. The 1997 NAS evaluation of fluoride does not affect the MCLG.

[14] This is the RfD calculated from the MCLG assuming 70kg body weight and intake of 2L/day. The MCLG was developed from a lowest effect level for crippling skeletal fluorosis of 20mg/day with continuous exposures over a 20-year or longer period. The LOAEL was divided by an uncertainty factor of 2.5 and a drinking water intake of 2L/day to obtain the MCLG.

[15] For objectionable dental fluorosis, a cosmetic effect.

[16] For crippling skeletal fluorosis in humans.

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
42. Hexachlorocyclo-pentadiene	0.05 (7/92)	0.05	0.007	D	0.006 [17] (01)	— [18] (01)		
43. Lead	0 (6/91)	TT[19]	—	B2	NA	B2 (88)		
44. Lindane (γ-hexa-chlorocyclohexane)	0.0002 (1/91)	0.0002	0.0003	C	0.0003 (88)	NA		
45. Mercury (Inorganic)	0.002 (1/91)	0.002	0.0003	D	0.0003 [20] (97)	— [20] (97)		
46. Methoxychlor	0.04 (1/91)	0.04	0.005	D	0.005 (90)	D (90)		
47. Monochlorobenzene (Chlorobenzene)	0.1 (1/91)	0.1	0.02	D	0.02 (90)	D (90)		
48. Nitrate (as N)	10 (1/91)	10	1.6 [21]	D	1.6 [21] (91)	NA		
49. Nitrite (as N)	1 (1/91)	1	0.16 [21]	D	0.1[22] (87)	NA		
Nitrate + Nitrite (as N)	10 (1/91)	10	—	—	—	—		
50. Oxamyl (Vydate)	**0.2 (7/92)**	**0.2**	**0.025**	**E**	**0.025 (87)**	**NA**	**0.001 (10/00)**	**E (10/00)**
51. Pentachlorophenol	0 (1/91)	0.001	0.03	B2	0.03 (91)	B2 (91)		

[17] RfD based on the same toxicological study as that of the MCLG but using benchmark dose modeling for the dose-response analysis.

[18] E by inhalation exposure. The potential for carcinogenicity by the oral route is unknown.

[19] Lead action level: 0.015 mg/L.

[20] Mercury Study Report to Congress assessment (US EPA 1997): RfD for inorganic Hg of 0.0003 mg/kg/day retained. Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, inorganic mercury is not likely to be a human carcinogen at levels found in water.

[21] RfD in mg N/kg/day back-calculated from epidemiological studies on the basis of 0.64 L/day and a 4-kg infant.

[22] RfD in mg N/kg/day back-calculated from epidemiological studies on the basis of 1 L/day and a 10-kg child. It is equivalent to a RfD of 0.16 mg/kg/day if 0.64 L/day and a 4-kg infant were used.

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
52. Picloram	**0.5 (7/92)**	**0.5**	**0.07**	**D**	**0.07 (87)**	**NA**	**0.20 (4/98)**	**E (4/98)**
53. Polychlorinated biphenyls (Aroclors)	0 (1/91)	0.0005	—	B2	2-7 $x10^{-5}$ (96)	B2 (96)		
54. Selenium[23]	0.05 (1/91)	0.05	0.005	D	0.005 (91)	D (91)		
55. Simazine	0.004 (7/92)	0.004	0.005	C	0.005 (93)	NA		
56. Styrene	0.1 (1/91)	0.1	0.2	C	0.2 (90)	NA		
57. 2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	0 (7/92)	$3x10^{-8}$	10^{-9}	B2				
58. Tetrachloroethylene ("perc")	0 (1/91)	0.005	0.01	B2	0.01 (88)	NA	Canceled	
59. Thallium	0.0005 (7/92)	0.002	0.00007	D	0.00008 (90)	D (90)	Canceled	
60. Toluene	1 (1/91)	1	0.2	D	0.2 (90)	D (90)		
61. Toxaphene	0 (1/91)	0.003	NA	B2	NA	B2 (91)	Canceled	
62. 2,4,5-TP (Silvex; 2,4,5-Trichlorophen-oxypropionic acid)	0.05 (1/91)	0.05	0.008	D	0.008 (88)	D (88)	Canceled	
63. Trichlorobenzene (1,2,4-)	0.07 (7/92)	0.07	0.01	D	0.01 (92)	D (91)		
64. Trichloroethane (1,1,1-)	0.20 (7/87)	0.20	0.035	D	NA (91)	D (90)		
65. Trichloroethane (1,1,2-)	0.003 (7/92)	0.005	0.004	C	0.004 (91)	C (91)	Canceled	
66. Trichloroethylene	0 (7/87)	0.005	—	B2	NA (89)	NA (89)	Canceled	

[23] NAS (2000b) tolerable upper intake level (UL) for selenium for adolescents and adults is 0.4 mg/day, a value equivalent to the RfD of 0.005 mg/kg/day established in 1991.

Table 2 (continued)

	Regulation (month/year)				IRIS (year)		OPP (month/year)	
Chemical	***MCLG, mg/L***	***MCL, mg/L***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD***	***Cancer grp.***	***RfD mg/kg/d***	***Cancer grp.***
67. Vinyl chloride	0 (7/87)	0.002	—	A	0.003 (00)	A [24] (00)		
68. Xylenes (total)	10 (1/91)	10	2	D	2 (88)	D (88)		

[24] Using the 1996 proposed cancer guidelines, VC is a known human carcinogen by the inhalation route of exposure, based on human epidemiological data, and by analogy the oral route because of positive animal bioassay data as well as pharmacokinetic data allowing dose extrapolation across routes.

Table 3. Assessment by IRIS, OPP, ATSDR, and NAS of chemicals considered under the first six-year review cycle

Chemical, Year Regulated	*90*	*91*	*92*	*93*	*94*	*95*	*96*	*97*	*98*	*99*	*00*	*01*	*≥02*
Acrylamide ’91		IRIS											IRIS
Alachlor ’91				IRIS					OPP				IRIS
Antimony ’92		IRIS	ATSDR										IRIS
Asbestos ’91					ATSDR								IRIS
Atrazine ’91				IRIS									IRIS ATSDR
Barium ’91			ATSDR						IRIS				
Benzene ’87								ATSDR			IRIS		
Benzo[a]pyrene ’92			IRIS			ATSDR							IRIS, ATSDR
Beryllium ’92			ATSDR							IRIS			ATSDR
Cadmium ’91		IRIS								ATSDR			IRIS
Carbofuran ’91													OPP
Carbon tetrachloride ’87		IRIS			ATSDR								IRIS
Chlordane ’91					ATSDR				IRIS				
Chromium ’91									IRIS		ATSDR		
Copper ‘91	ATSDR										NAS		IRIS
Cyanide ’92								ATSDR					IRIS
2,4-D ’91													OPP
Dalapon ’92													
Di (2-ethylhexyl) adipate ’92			IRIS										IRIS

Table 3 (continued)

Chemical, Year Regulated	*90*	*91*	*92*	*93*	*94*	*95*	*96*	*97*	*98*	*99*	*00*	*01*	*≥02*
Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate '92				ATSDR									IRIS ATSDR
1,2-DBCP '91		IRIS	ATSDR										
1,2-Dichlorobenzene '91	IRIS												IRIS
1,4-Dichlorobenzene '87					IRIS				ATSDR				IRIS
1,2-Dichloroethane '87		IRIS			ATSDR								IRIS ATSDR
1,1-Dichloroethylene '87					ATSDR				IRIS				IRIS
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene '91	IRIS						ATSDR						
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene '91							ATSDR						
Dichloromethane '92		IRIS									ATSDR		
1,2-Dichloropropane '91		IRIS											
Dinoseb '92													
Diquat '92						OPP							OPP
Endothall '92													OPP
Endrin '92							ATSDR						
Epichlorohydrin '91			IRIS										
Ethylbenzene '91		IRIS								ATSDR			IRIS
Ethylene dibromide '91		IRIS	ATSDR										IRIS
Fluoride '86				ATSDR NAS				NAS					ATSDR
Glyphosate '92				OPP									IRIS

Table 3 (continued)

Chemical, Year Regulated	*90*	*91*	*92*	*93*	*94*	*95*	*96*	*97*	*98*	*99*	*00*	*01*	*≥02*
Heptachlor ’91		IRIS	OPP	ATSDR									
Heptachlor epoxide ’91		IRIS	OPP	ATSDR									
Hexachlorobenzene ’92		IRIS					ATSDR						ATSDR
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene ’92										ATSDR		IRIS	
Lead ’91										ATSDR			
Lindane ’91										ATSDR			IRIS
Mercury ’91 (Inorganic)						IRIS		EPA[1]		ATSDR			
Methoxychlor ’91	IRIS				ATSDR								OPP, ATSDR
Monochlorobenzene ’91	IRIS, ATSDR												
Nitrate ’91		IRIS				NAS							
Nitrite ’91						NAS							
Oxamyl ’92											OPP		
Pentachlorophenol ’91		IRIS			ATSDR								IRIS, ATSDR
Picloram ’92									OPP				
PCBs ’91							IRIS				ATSDR		IRIS
Selenium ’91		IRIS					ATSDR				NAS		ATSDR
Simazine ’92				IRIS									OPP

[1] Mercury Study Report to Congress (US EPA 1997).

Table 3 (continued)

Chemical, Year Regulated	*90*	*91*	*92*	*93*	*94*	*95*	*96*	*97*	*98*	*99*	*00*	*01*	*≥02*
Styrene ’91	IRIS		ATSDR										IRIS [2]
2,3,7,8-TCDD ’92									ATSDR				IRIS
Tetrachloroethylene ’91								ATSDR					IRIS
Thallium ’92	IRIS		ATSDR										IRIS
Toluene ’91	IRIS										ATSDR		IRIS
Toxaphene ’91		IRIS					ATSDR						
2,4,5-TP ’91													
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene ’92		IRIS											
1,1,1-Trichloroethane ’87	IRIS					ATSDR							IRIS
1,1,2-Trichloroethane ’92	ATSDR	IRIS											
Trichloroethylene ’87								ATSDR					IRIS
Vinyl chloride ’87								ATSDR			IRIS		
Xylenes ’91						ATSDR							IRIS

[2] Joint IRIS/ Styrene Information and Research Council.

Table 4. Evaluation of the literature search for reproductive and developmental toxicity
(New IRIS assessments initiated for chemicals given in **bold**)

Chemical	*Comments*
Cyanide	Based on NTP (1993) 13-week study, ATSDR (1997) identified a NOAEL of 4.5 mg/kg/day for reproductive effects in male rats (decreases in epididymis and testis weights and reduction in spermatid head size and count). The current 1992 NPDWR RfD of 0.02 mg/kg/day is based on a NOAEL of 10.8 mg/kg/day in a 2-year study for weight loss, thyroid effects and myelin degeneration in rats. New IRIS assessment initiated.
Dalapon	New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	Current RfD/MCLG of 1992 based on a developmental toxicity study in rats that identified a NOAEL of 170 mg/kg/day. WHO (1996) and the European Commission (EC, 1999) considered the LOAEL to be 170 mg/kg/day and the NOAEL to be the next lower dose of 28 mg/kg/day. Similarly, IARC (2000) indicated effects at 170 mg/kg/day. New IRIS assessment initiated to reevaluate the available developmental and reproductive studies, and to evaluate new studies that have become available on the toxicity of DEHA and its metabolites.
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Dinoseb	Current RfD based on three-generation reproductive study in rats. Developmental effects seen at higher doses than are reproductive effects. New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Endrin	Reproductive and developmental effects occur at doses above those causing hepatotoxicity, the critical effect. New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Fluoride	No new studies identified in the literature search indicating that fluoride adversely affects reproductive or developmental endpoints. Epidemiological studies show no evidence of an association between the consumption of fluoridated drinking water by mothers and increased risk of spontaneous abortion or congenital malformation (WHO, 2002).
Monochlorobenzene	New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Nitrate	Current RfD/MCLG established to protect infants, the most susceptible segment of the population. Epidemiological studies of maternal nitrate exposure from drinking water and developmental effects in offspring or spontaneous abortion are inconclusive (Croen et al. 1997). Reproductive and developmental effects in experimental animals are not the critical effects. Epidemiological studies of nitrate in drinking water and cancer incidence, including non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, a childhood cancer, and bladder cancer are inconclusive (Weyer et al. 2001; Ward et al. 1996). New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.

Table 4 (continued)

Chemical	*Comments*
Nitrite	Current RfD/MCLG is protective of methemoglobinemia in infants, the most susceptible segment of the population. Sodium nitrite was tested in mice by NIEHS (Chapin et al. 1997) using the Reproductive Assessment by Continuous Breeding protocol; reproductive effects are not the critical effects and did not occur at doses as high as 425 mg nitrite/kg/day. New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Selenium	NAS (2000b) assessment of Se confirms the current RfD of 1991 based on epidemiological studies of selenosis in humans. Epidemiological studies of Se deficiency and male infertility, pregnancy-induced hypertension and congenital heart disease, are inconclusive (ATSDR 1996). In experimental animals, reproductive and developmental toxicity are not the critical effects (NTP 1996). New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
Thallium	ATSDR (1992) identified LOAELs for developmental effects (impairment of learning ability) and reproductive effects (histological alteration of testis) in rats of 0.08 and 0.7 mg/kg/day, respectively, compared to the NOAEL of 0.2 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested and the basis of the NPDWR. Also, the present NOAEL of 0.2 mg/kg/day is debatable: Cal/EPA (1999) considers the NOAEL to be the next lower dose tested of 0.04 mg/kg/day for changes in blood chemistry, alopecia and lacrimation in rats. Evaluation of developmental neurological effects of TI by the oral route need to be assessed. New IRIS assessment initiated.
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	Current RfD protective of chronic liver effects would also protect against fetotoxicity and teratogenicity. New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	Current RfD based on a multigeneration reproductive study in rats. New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	New information does not support need to revise RfD/MCLG.

Table 5. Overall review of chemicals

		Reproductive/developmental concerns					Identify assessment needing updating	
Chemical	***RfD/Cancer group changed***	***Ongoing IRIS/ OPP assessment***	***MCLG = 0***	***Recent (≥97) EPA assessment available***	***Literature search for repro./ develop. endpoints***	***High priority, nominate for new assessment***	***Literature search for other toxicological endpoints***	***Nominate for new assessment***
Acrylamide		✔	✔		No		No	
Alachlor	✔	✔	✔	✔	No		No	
Antimony		✔			No		No	
Asbestos		✔			No		No	
Atrazine		✔			No		No	
Barium				✔	No		No	
Benzene			✔	✔	No		No	
Benzo[a]pyrene		✔	✔		No		No	
Beryllium	✔			✔	No		No	
Cadmium		✔		✔	No		No	
Carbofuran		✔			No		No	
Carbon tetrachloride		✔	✔		No		No	
Chlordane			✔	✔	No		No	
Chromium	✔			✔	No		No	
Copper		✔			No		No	
Cyanide					**Yes**	**Yes**	No	
2,4-D		✔			No		No	

Table 5 (continued)

		Reproductive/developmental concerns					Identify assessment needing updating	
Chemical	***RfD/Cancer group changed***	***Ongoing IRIS/ OPP assessment***	***MCLG = 0***	***Recent (≥97) EPA assessment available***	***Literature search for repro./ develop. endpoints***	***High priority, nominate for new assessment***	***Literature search for other toxicological endpoints***	***Nominate for new assessment***
Dalapon					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	No
Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate					**Yes**	**Yes**	No	
Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate		✔	✔		No		No	
1,2-DBCP			✔		No		No	
1,2-Dichlorobenzene		✔			No		No	
1,4-Dichlorobenzene		✔			No		No	
1,2-Dichloroethane		✔	✔		No		No	
1,1-Dichloroethylene		✔		✔	No		No	
Dichloroethylene (cis-1,2-)					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Dichloroethylene (trans-1,2-)					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Dichloromethane			✔		No		No	
1,2-Dichloropropane			✔		No		No	
Dinoseb					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Diquat	✔	✔			No		No	
Endothall		✔			No		No	

Table 5 (continued)

		Reproductive/developmental concerns					Identify assessment needing updating	
Chemical	***RfD/Cancer group changed***	***Ongoing IRIS/ OPP assessment***	***MCLG = 0***	***Recent (≥97) EPA assessment available***	***Literature search for repro./ develop. endpoints***	***High priority, nominate for new assessment***	***Literature search for other toxicological endpoints***	***Nominate for new assessment***
Endrin					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Epichlorohydrin			✔		No		No	
Ethylbenzene		✔			No		No	
Ethylene dibromide		✔	✔		No		No	
Fluoride					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**Yes (NAS)**
Glyphosate	✔	✔			No		No	
Heptachlor			✔		No		No	
Heptachlor epoxide			✔		No		No	
Hexachlorobenzene			✔		No		No	
Hexachlorocyclopenta-diene				✔	No		No	
Lead			✔		No		No	
Lindane		✔			No		No	
Mercury (inorganic)				✔	No		No	
Methoxychlor		✔			No		No	
Monochlorobenzene					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Nitrate					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**

Table 5 (continued)

		Reproductive/developmental concerns					Identify assessment needing updating	
Chemical	***RfD/Cancer group changed***	***Ongoing IRIS/ OPP assessment***	***MCLG = 0***	***Recent (≥97) EPA assessment available***	***Literature search for repro./ develop. endpoints***	***High priority, nominate for new assessment***	***Literature search for other toxicological endpoints***	***Nominate for new assessment***
Nitrite					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Oxamyl	✔			✔	No		No	
Pentachlorophenol		✔	✔		No		No	
Picloram	✔			✔	No		No	
PCBs		✔	✔		No		No	
Selenium					**Yes**	No	No (NAS, 2000)	
Simazine		✔			No		No	
Styrene		✔			No		No	
2,3,7,8-TCDD		✔	✔		No		No	
Tetrachloroethylene		✔	✔		No		No	
Thallium					**Yes**	**Yes**	No	
Toluene		✔			No		No	
Toxaphene			✔		No		No	
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**

Table 5 (continued)

		Reproductive/developmental concerns					Identify assessment needing updating	
Chemical	***RfD/Cancer group changed***	***Ongoing IRIS/ OPP assessment***	***MCLG = 0***	***Recent (≥97) EPA assessment available***	***Literature search for repro./ develop. endpoints***	***High priority, nominate for new assessment***	***Literature search for other toxicological endpoints***	***Nominate for new assessment***
Trichlorobenzene (1,2,4-)					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Trichloroethane (1,1,1-)		✔			No		No	
Trichloroethane (1,1,2-)					**Yes**	No	**Yes**	**No**
Trichloroethylene		✔	✔		No		No	
Vinyl chloride			✔	✔	No		No	
Xylenes		✔			No		No	